

# Riley County Vision 2025 Committee Meeting

May 22, 2008

7:30 – 9:30 p.m. County Commission Chambers

## Meeting Summary

### Welcome & Review of Public Comments

- The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm by facilitator David Procter. Procter welcomed the group and reminded those in attendance that comment cards were available for public comments. Procter also re-introduced co-facilitator Dan Kahl to the Committee. Dan was substituting for Terrie McCants who is on vacation.
- Monty Wedel reported that there were no public comments submitted from the previous meeting.

### Full Group Discussion on Implementation Strategies

- Wedel reviewed the Committee's charge and indicated that the Committee has progressed to a certain point but there's still more work to be done.
- Wedel reviewed the original list of implementation strategies initially proposed during the Vision 2025 public meetings. Following the PowerPoint presentation, Wedel discussed the Development Control Options, describing how each strategy ranked on a continuum of restrictiveness. Wedel then directed the attention of the Committee to the list of possible implementation strategies. Wedel encouraged the Committee to suggest any additional strategies that weren't already on the list. The Committee suggested the following be added to the list:
  - Establish an exclusive Ag district (i.e., all proposals must be reviewed, except for Ag uses);
  - Development Standards approach;
  - Decrease the minimum lot size from 20 acres;
  - Waiver, Easement or both; and
  - Clustering.
- D. Procter then proposed a voting system using adhesive "dots" in order for the Committee to focus on a smaller number of preferred strategies. After much discussion, it was clear that there was some confusion regarding some of the terminology; specifically, what is the clear difference between a "waiver" and an "ag easement" and what is meant by "clustering".
- The Committee decided that the options of "status quo" and "increasing minimum lot size" could be eliminated from the list.
- The Committee stated that they needed more information on "transfer of development rights" before they could accept or reject it as a viable implementation strategy.
- The Committee stated that although the County should promote and encourage conservation easement programs, it should not be involved with raising funds to acquire or purchase development rights.
- The Committee requested additional information on the rules and regulations on the establishment of Urban Growth Boundaries.
- Finally, the Committee suggested that planning staff provide the Committee with some development scenarios, utilizing some of the implementation strategies. This would give an illustration of the pros and cons of each approach.

### Next Step

- Planning staff to create test scenarios for the Committee.

**Next Full Committee meeting: June 12, 2008, 7:30 PM at the County Commission Chambers**

**Adjourned**